DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 693 HE 010 431

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | The Church's Ministry in Higher Education in Pennsylvania: The Next Ten Years. |
| INSTITUTION | Pennsylvania Commission for United Ministries in Higher Education, Berwyn, Pa. |
| PUB DATE | 78 |
| NOTE | 29p.; Presentation made at the tenth anniversary celebration of the Pennsylvania Commission for United Ministries in Higher Education (State College, Pennsylvania, March 10-11, 1977) |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Pennsylvania Commission for United Ministries in Higher Education, 61 Cassett Avenue, Berwyn Pennsylvania 19312 ($1.00) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Christianity; *Church Programs; Church Related Colleges; *Church Role; Conference Reports; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; *Religious Education; Speeches; Statewide Planning |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Campus Ministry |

ABSTRACT

The Pennsylvania Commission for United Ministries in Higher Education is seven Protestant communions working together to carry out a Christian Ministry in colleges and universities in the state. As part of the organization's tenth anniversary celebration conference, two presentations were given concerning future directions for higher education in the state and the Church's ministry there. Caryl M. Kline spoke on the coming decade in higher education in Pennsylvania, and Parker Palmer spoke on "The Campus and the Claims of the Gospel: The Next Ten Years." (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

- ED158693

# THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

# THE NEXT TEN YEARS

**Pennsylvania Commission**
**For**
**United Ministries In Higher Education**

**Tenth Anniversary Celebration**
**1967–1977**

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 018 431

umhe

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Pa. Comm. for United Ministries in H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

**Pennsylvania Commission**
**For**
**United Ministries In Higher Education**

**Tenth Anniversary Celebration**
**1967–1977**

Copyright © 1978
Pennsylvania Commission for
United Ministries In Higher Education

# Preface

On March 10 and 11, 1977 the Pennsylvania Commission For United Ministries In Higher Education (UMHE) celebrated its tenth anniversary at its annual meeting at the Nittany Lion Inn in State College, Pa. As a part of its celebration, the Commission members and campus ministers heard two presentations concerning future directions for higher education in Pennsylvania and the Church's ministry in higher education.

Caryl M. Kline, the Secretary of Education for the Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania spoke on "Pennsylvania Higher Education: The Decade of the 80's." Parker Palmer, the Dean of Studies at Pendle Hill in Wallingford, Pa., spoke on "The Campus and The Claims of the Gospel: The Next Ten Years."

The Pennsylvania Commission for UMHE is seven Protestant communions working together to carry out a Christian ministry in higher education in Pennsylvania. These seven Protestant communions are: the American Baptist Churches in Pennsylvania, the Christian Church, the four Districts of the Church of the Brethren, the five Dioceses of the Episcopal Church, the four Conferences of the United Church of Christ, the four Conferences of the United

Methodist Church, and the Synod of the Trinity of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA.

Recognizing the strengths of the distinctive heritages of each of these communions and yet its oneness in mission in higher education, the Pennsylvania Commission for UMHE provides a comprehensive ministry of the Church which affirms the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the basis and compelling force of its work, and shares in the reconciling work of God among persons as they find wholeness and purpose in life in the arena of higher education.

It carries out this ministry through the shared responsibility of local united ministry boards, trained ministers in higher education, and local parishes at colleges and universities throughout Pennsylvania.

It is presently supporting ministry in higher education at Bloomsburg, Cheyney, Drexel, Indiana, Millersville, Shippensburg, Temple, Penn, California, Clarion, Edinboro, Mansfield, Penn State, Slippery Rock, Pittsburgh, West Chester, and the Northeast Pennsylvania Regional Ministry in Higher Education.

We are deeply grateful to the Pitcairn-Crabbe Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa., and its Executive Secretary, Alfred W. Wishart, Jr. for providing a generous grant to allow us to print the speeches by Caryl Kline and Parker Palmer so that they can be distributed to Commission members, campus ministers, local pastors of the supporting communions for their discussion and study about future directions for the Church's ministry in higher education.

*—David C. Rich*
*Executive Director*

# Contents

**Contributors** 9

1. Pennsylvania Higher Education: The Decade of the 80's 11
*Caryl M. Kline*

2. The Campus and the Claims of the Gospel: 21
The Next Ten Years
*Parker Palmer*

## Contributors

1. Caryl M. Kline, Secretary of Education, Department of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

2. Parker Palmer, Dean of Studies, Pendle Hill (a Quaker living/learning study center), Wallingford, Pennsylvania

# Pennsylvania Higher Education: The Decade of the '80s

Caryl M. Kline

I wonder how many of you remember the opening words of Charles Dickens in the Tale of Two Cities. "It is the best of times, it is the worst of times, it is the age of wisdom, it is the age of foolishness, it is the epic of belief, it is the epic of incredulity, it is the season of light, it is the season of darkness, it is the spring of hope, it is the winter of despair. There is everything before us, there is nothing before us. We are all going directly to heaven, we are all going indirectly the other way."

Dickens' words might be spoken about education in America today.

When I was growing up in the university community of Madison, Wisconsin, there was almost a feeling of reverence on the part of townsfolk toward the faculty of the university. Certainly there was great respect for them. It wasn't very long after that that the university faculty was being accused of being a lot of communists and we were being subjected to investigations by State Senator Bollens for communism, radicalism and free love. It was a little early for that kind of thing!

One of the distressing things was that Alexander Miklejohn, president of Amherst College—a great leader in education back in the

30's—was brought to the University of Wisconsin to start the Experimental College. He did some very interesting things in education. He helped students to read books they might not otherwise find on the library shelf, certainly not in English classes. He encouraged students to sit for long hours together and discuss ideas. This wasn't acceptable to the legislature, and so the university found itself on the very short end of the appropriations stick.

In the history of this nation, there have been times when education and educators were thought to be very essential. Then, with little warning, we were something else.

If there are any historians in the group, you may remember the Clifford Berryman cartoon showing the daisy chain of American intellectuals and college professors led by Professor Raymond Moley of Columbia, marching into Franklin Roosevelt's White House. Intellectuals in government, however, went into eclipse in the 50's, and there was not great support for public education or educational appropriations until that day in 1957 when Sputnik went into orbit. If you remember that day, you will remember that this nation virtually turned over. I was running for Congress that year. Just a few weeks before Sputnik was launched, I had been waited upon by the Vice Chancellor of Syracuse University and the President of Le Moyne College. These gentlemen told me to withdraw my proposal for the establishment of a community college in Syracuse because it would destroy the enrollment at their two institutions.

But when Sputnik went aloft, it was quite another thing. Then we wanted instant space scientists and technically trained young people. Community colleges rapidly grew in number. The money wells were filled; you could do almost anything you wanted in the field of education and be funded for it.

Once we got to the moon, however, people began to say: "Why did we spend all that money? Was that necessary? Why didn't we put that money into something else?" And we have seen the attitude toward education going downhill once more.

Certainly education, and particularly higher education, does not enjoy today a very high priority on the list of concerns in Washington nor in the state capitol. You only need to sit through a school board budget hearing in your local community or attend a budget hearing in Harrisburg to realize how drastically the political climate has

changed. For this there are many reasons. The publication of what has happened to th S.A.T. scores in reading and in mathematics is one. Grade inflation in both the high school and the college level is another. If you read the Washington Post you may remember that in August, 1976, there was a picture of a valedictorian from a Washington high school—a young Black man who was functionally illiterate. He could not be accepted at any college or university in the Washington area. He was a valedictorian who could not read.

For many years the advocates for college training have talked frequently and persuasively about the difference in life-time earnings between those people who go to college and those people who finish their education at eighth grade or twelfth grade. The comparison has always been unfavorable to the youngsters who drop out at grades eight or twelve.

But now, carpenters, plumbers, steel workers, municipal employees are getting salaries that are higher than the salaries of many who graduate from college. The life-time earning argument has lost its impact, and there is a changed attitude toward college education once again. There is a reading public for such articles and books as Carolyn Bird's publication "The Case Against College."

The financing of education—both basic and higher education—is or should be a major concern for all citizens of Pennsylvania. A crucial issue facing us is the state subsidy for basic education. What is the subsidy that the state is going to give in reimbursement to the local school districts?

You may recall that about a year ago New York City was in a critical financial state. We were asking the President of the United States to come to their rescue. The President said, it might be that the federal government would give some aid to the *most important services* furnished by the city.

What were the services considered for support? Fire, police protection and sanitation. Not one word about education! City College of New York was forced to close temporarily. This was the institution which had reached out to the *people* of New York City. But when talking about helping New York City, the President didn't make a single suggestion about giving any aid to education.

In higher education as we look to the decade of the 80's, we are faced with possible falling enrollments, with dwindling finances,

declining appropriations, the threat of more and more government control of education, the putting on of the business image by educational institutions. We are faced with the struggle between liberal arts and career or job oriented education; with the emergence of consumer advocates for education and an increasing list of suits being brought against educational institutions. We are faced with the demand to become cost effective to do something about articulating the courses of study in high schools and colleges.

Robert Maynard Hutchins, when President of the University of Chicago, said that the future of education is the future of everything else. Therefore, the kind of education that we furnish to our citizens through the colleges and universities of this nation is the key to the remaining 25 years of this century and surely to the upcoming decades of the 21st Century.

The threat of declining college enrollments has been with us for several years. It has not happened.

Why it has not happened is that there is a new market for post-secondary education. As appropriations go down, as students turn away from both public and private institutions because of high tuitions, we have become aware of the "non-traditional" student. Approximately 250 Continuing Education for Women programs have been established over this country. Several thousands of mature women have returned to complete their college degrees or have undertaken higher education study for the first time. Women who have IQ's of 140 who say, I had a four year scholarship but I didn't think I wanted to go to college.

Now they are married and their husbands find it a little difficult when people ask, "What college did your wife attend?" Or they aren't married. Or they have worked and put their husbands through professional school, and then they are so far behind intellectually that the husband wants to find someone more interesting and intriguing, so off he goes. And there is the divorced woman, left with children to support. I might point out to you, ladies and gentlemen, that only 44 percent of the divorces in Pennsylvania get any kind of settlement. They do get child support if their children are under 18 years of age but less than half of the 44 percent are able to collect child support.

It isn't only young women. A woman divorced after having been married for as long as 20 to 35 years may be left without any tangible

means of support, and frequently with children to educate. Her alternatives are a clerical or service job or resuming her education and ultimately entering the job market at a professional level.

It is not only the mature women, however, who are contributing to the maintenance of college enrollment. If you have sons and daughters in their 20's, you may have—as I have had—a "stop-out" son or daughter. This is very typical of what is happening to the young men and women in this country. They are not interested in going through a whole four years sequence. They are a little bored, they say the college curriculum is not relevant. They leave college to go find something that is relevant. After they've been out there trying to make a living, they find out that perhaps education was relevant so they return to complete their degrees.

The returning "stop-out" or "drop-out" is another potential segment of college enrollment. The Carnegie Commission has pointed out that over 60 percent of those young people enrolled as freshmen in college last fall will not finish their baccalaureate degrees at the end of four years. 60 percent! That means that only four out of every ten youngsters that came to college last fall are going to be graduated in 1980. We must think about this, because as they go on, they will discover that they are not really qualified to do some of the things they want to do. They seek a way to return to college.

We must persuade people that education is a continuing life-long process. You never stop your education. Thus you prepare yourself for all the opportunities or exigencies of life that may come. This is true for men as well as women. In this nation men and women will be changing their occupations four or five times during their lifetimes. They cannot do it unless they continue their education. This is another college market. How do we meet the educational needs of the employed man or woman? We don't do it in the traditional manner of education. Perhaps we hold classes in their plants, in a center city department store, in a public school building, and at unusual hours fitted to their work schedules.

Another alternative is the external studies program which is really independent study. The student is given a syllabus, suggested readings, written assignments. He works on his own and three times a semester the class meets with the professor for at least a three-hour session.

A student wishing to return to a college or university may also gain credit by taking the CLEP (College Level Examination Program) general or subject examinations which enable a student to gain as many as 60 credits toward a degree. A student may come back for an MBA in an "Executive Program" meeting one week on Friday and Saturday and the student is forgiven one day of work by his employer and the alternate week classes meet on Saturday and Sunday on the student's own time. Many business and industries are sponsoring their own undergraduate and graduate programs.

There is a continuing education program tailored to almost every segment of the population. Colleges, universities and post-secondary schools are making tremendous efforts to serve the continuing education needs of our population.

Now there is another way and an increasingly popular way to earn a degree. The New York Empire State College permits you to get a full degree without ever being in a classroom. You can earn credits by examination, by sending in experiential material and having it evaluated for credit. Many colleges and organizations are offering this opportunity, among them Antioch College, Thomas Edison University of New Jersey, the Mid-American University which serves several middle western states from its headquarters in Omaha.

Now there is another thing you have to look at. The mature student, the student who has been out of college for a while, must have far more careful counselling and guidance than the young student. Returning students are apprehensive and frightened. Perhaps they haven't been thinking about *retention* of ideas for a long time. They have marital problems, health problems, financial problems, transportation problems. You name it, they have it. You must work with them until you are sure that they are stable and able to pursue a college curriculum. They are usually very good students but they need excellent and always available academic and personal counselling.

A university or a college has to keep its boundaries porous. It can't be bound by inflexible rules. It has to bend.

Declining enrollments in some academic areas is going to be one of the major problems in education in Pennsylvania in the next ten years. When you don't have enough students in a department or in a course to keep the professor, what happens to him or her?

There are many professors who believe that their tenure has given them a life hold on their job. Peter Drucker, in a recent issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* in an article entitled "The Professor as Featherbedder," said that "Without major changes in policies, colleges and university professors are likely to become an endangered species in the decades ahead and unionization and political lobbying are unlikely to help anymore than they have helped to protect the anthracite coal miners or the railroads."

"In their own self interest, faculy members need radically new policies in three areas: they need an effective substitute for a self-defeating tenure policy; they need systematic personnel development to enable them to benefit from future opportunities; and they need organized placement of the "average," middle-aged professor in work and careers outside of academics. But above all, faculty members need management, either self-imposed management or management by administrators."

"The one change in status that professors are likely to resist the most strenuously is any change in their tenure system. But tenure will increasingly become a threat for tenured faculty members. Rather than protect professors against change it will entrap them. Without changes in tenure policies, colleges will soon be unable to bring in new people. That in turn can only accelerate the decline in graduate enrollment, thus creating greater pressures to cut both faculty size and faculty salaries. For 20 or more years ahead, college faculty will be aging, and any group unable to renew itself becomes stagnant and stale. The present tenure policy condemns higher education to becoming a declining industry and eventually a dying industry."

Tenure is an exceedingly serious problem, especially when you look at it in conjunction with the declining financial resources many private colleges have. Let us suppose that in University X, we are faced with removing $700,000 from the budget for the next academic year. What does that mean? It means a great many faculty members will have to retire, or be persuaded to look elsewhere—*if* there are any jobs to be found, or urged to seek another career. It means that some departments ultimately will have to go. Can we make such major changes with a sense of humanity?

I find it very difficult to deal with education on the basis of cost effectiveness or on the basis of zero base budgeting. I was brought up

to deal with men and women in academic life on a very personal kind of basis. When there was a problem, a professor could go to his chairman, the chairman could go to the Dean, the Dean in my day could go to the President. Today we don't do that, at least in large colleges. We are making of our educational institutions business firms. Each and every one of us must stop and suggest to boards of trustees and administrators that they remember that education has always been a very personal kind of thing. Education must be a personal give and take.

I think back to my own college days and the professors that I had. I once had a disagreement with my English professor over an Algernon Charles Swinburne passage about "dead men who rise up never." He ordered me to report to his office at 1:30 in the afternoon. So at 1:30 I was in his office and from 1:30 until 5 o'clock he read Algernon Charles Swinburne aloud to me. When I got my grade in the course, the card read, "In spite of Swinburne and his dead men who rise up never."

How many professors today would have the time or the interest to do that for their students? Education must not become as impersonal as business or industry. I submit to you that if our youngsters had a more personal relationship with their professors, there wouldn't be so many stop-outs and drop-outs. Education would be a more vital, dynamic challenging experience. For some of us union contracts which prescribe contact hours and overload requirements preclude the personal quality of education.

Another question for the next decade is the kind of education you give. It's the old battle between liberal arts and job oriented education. Young people need help in determining and reinforcing their moral values and beliefs, We need to help our young people to learn and to reaffirm in ourselves the positive values of our culture. We must be able to express our love of our fellowman and to place the interests of community above our personal interests. It is this sense of perspective that has inspired the growth of this free nation for more than 200 years. The college has an obligation to impart these values, not only by teaching but by the example of faculty and staff. I know of no other way to do it except through the liberal arts.

What kind of an education will do all of these things and still provide the kind of education that these young men and women need?

It has to be a curriculum in which in-depth courses are so integrated in subject matter that the student sees the inter-relation of his learning. If you read Plato's Republic, you learn much that is applicable to your political science course. You learn much that is applicable to your fine arts course. It all interweaves. This is the value of an effective liberal arts education.

The job of a liberal arts curriculum is to teach a student to think. Teach him how to learn, how to relate one area of knowledge to another, how to communicate with clarity both orally and in writing, how to analyze subject matter and come to logical conclusions. The small liberal arts college understands that it cannot offer the "cafeteria line" of courses offered by the large universities. But instead of the "once-over-lightly" of a myriad of subjects, the small private colleges have an advantage in helping students understand the inter-relationship of social sciences, the natural sciences and arts. That's why in our larger universities and colleges today we are suggesting that we begin to deal in "cluster" colleges, i.e., departments that come together to form a small college within the larger institution.

St. Augustine said that, as a result of his education, he could read anything that was written, understand anything he heard said, and say anything he thought. Hopefully, the graduates of our colleges and universities will be thus endowed. But may I suggest to you that if this is to be true, our institutions must become far more personalized institutions.

In the minds of many Americans, the major purpose of education is to acquire marketable skills, something saleable, the means to make a living.

Harold Hotchkinson, Director of the National Institute of Education, comments that we must separate the college degree-granting function from the Occupational licensing function. A liberal arts education trains a student for a job but not necessarily for the first job. It gives the student something to work with as he trains in the job. It gives a person the tools that help him to go on to the second, third and fourth jobs.

According to the Educational Policy Center at Syracuse University, one half of what the graduate engineer studies today will be obsolete in ten years. One half of what he will need to know at

some point during his career is not yet known by anyone.

One third of the items on supermarket shelves didn't exist two years ago and three quarters of all the people employed twelve years from now will be producing goods that have not yet been conceived.

I wonder how many of you saw that New Yorker cartoon where two gentlemen are sitting together and one says to the other "Remember all those things we weren't going to live to see? Well, we're going to see them." That's what's happening today.

Terrell Bell, the former U.S. Commissioner of Education, has said that providing students with saleable skills doesn't necessarily mean a vocational skill, but rather the skill of analytical thinking. A mind trained to think is always marketable.

Not long ago, when, against my better judgment, I was reading Carolyn Bird's "The Case Against College," I was reminded of a story told by my high school Latin teacher. When she was queried as to the value of studying Latin, she said, "When Euclid was asked by a man what he would gain by learning the theorem dealing with equilateral triangles, Euclid replied, "Give this man a coin since he must show a profit for everything he learns."

We must learn to use our leisure time more wisely and a liberal education can make an important contribution toward this goal.

In closing, let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that you could do much for those students who come to you, not only by helping them find the money somewhere within your communities or within your universities that will enable them to stay on in school, but by counselling and encouraging them, by helping them to sort out their values and their futures, by guiding them toward becoming independent, responsible and creative human beings. Students—of whatever age—need your help.

If I have seemed, perhaps, in some despair about the future of American education, I do not mean to be. We must be positive and hopeful.

I would like to close with the words of that tall, lean gentleman who in 1835 was running for the legislature in Sangamon County in Illinois, Mr. Lincoln, when he said "If destruction be our lot, then we ourselves must be its author."

# The Campus and the Claims of the Gospel: The Next Ten Years

Parker J. Palmer

As I prepared to talk about the next ten years in the ministry to higher education, I decided to look ten years back. What was I hunching and predicting then? How good was my crystal ball?

The exercise was a mistake! The future I was projecting in 1967 was scarcely in line with the future I have been called to live out. In fact, if I had known with any precision what lay ahead in our national life, in higher education, or in my personal life—I'm not sure I would have renewed my option! One of God's many gifts to us is ignorance about the future, and I sometimes think we should make the most of it. God does not call us to bear more than we can, but we are clearly called to bear more than we *think* we can. God knows that we live more fully and faithfully in the actual present moment than we do in our fantasies of what the next moment will bring. In fact, one of the central spiritual disciplines is to deny ourselves head trips into the future, for those forays are always twisted by our wish to control reality or escape it.

But my topic is not simply the future. It is the claims of the gospel of Jesus Christ over the next ten years, and here I can find firmer ground on which to stand. For though the next ten years are beyond our ken, there is a constancy at the core of the gospel. God's claims on

our lives are once and for all time; though we waver, the gospel does not.

I

The idea of gospel constancy may be especially important in campus ministry, a ministry which has often been criticized for its vacillations and tendencies toward faddishness. The criticism has not been wholly misplaced. Campus ministry has always felt the tug of the market--from campus church to coffee house to the barricades to the human potential movement to meditation.

I do not mean to disparage the efforts of campus clergy to find ways of ministering in the academic environment—an environment which seems to make people impervious both to fear for their souls and joy in their salvation. I know of few ministries more demanding than yours, and I honor its work.

Rather than criticize the various forms which campus ministry has taken, I want to look at the assumption that lies behind these changing forms, and I want to contrast that assumption with the idea of gospel constancy. I mean the assumption that ministry must be responsive to its *context*. I mean the assumption that proclaiming the gospel at Penn State must be different from preaching the word in an inner-city parish.

A ministry based on this assumption runs two very large risks. First, a contextual ministry may end up having its terms set by the context rather than by the gospel. That risk is heightened by the fact that every human context contains immediate regards for those who fit in with it, while the gospel tends to make life more difficult. Second, a ministry based on the contextual assumption runs the risk of treating each context in isolation, as if it were unrelated to other settings in which human beings suffer and find life, as if Penn State and the inner city had nothing to do with another.

In my mind, there is no question that the campus ministry has taken these risks and often lost. In the name of speaking the university's language, campus ministers have sometimes intellectualized the gospel so that it does not transform the people who hear. Worse yet, campus ministers have sometimes abandoned the gospel in favor of establishing another discipline, the discipline of religious studies, which can gain respectability alongside all the rest. And campus

ministers have surely failed to penetrate the university's parochialism, failed to help the university understand its relations to and accountability for other human settings. Nowhere, not in business or government or the church itself, is there less recognition of human interdependence than in the university with its pervasive myths of cultural superiority and autonomy.

The problem with ministering contextually to Penn State and the inner city is two-fold. First, the ministry most needed in any place may be that which enters at right angles to the norms and life-style of the place, and is not in harmony with them. Thus, the ministry of intellect may be most needed not in the university but in the inner city where it could serve to empower people. And the ministry of the heart may be most needed not in the inner city but in the university where it could warm the coldness of concepts and theories.

Of course, no ministry should be exclusively one of either reason or emotion. Finally, every ministry must be a ministry of truth, that truth which makes us one, which makes us whole. And this is the second problem with ministering contextually to the inner city and to Penn State: we then fail to minister to their relationship. But the two are related, and the link is clear: The inner city symbolizes the place of the poor and the plight of the oppressed, while Penn State symbolizes the place of the rich and the powers of oppression. The context of your ministry is the world, with special attention to higher education's complicity in the world's grief.

## II

I want to talk further about the rich and the poor, for it is both good futurist sociology and good gospel theology to claim that much hinges on the relations of these two groups. On simple pragmatic grounds, the gross injustice between these groups brings us closer daily to all levels of human catastrophe, including nuclear war. We must rectify the imbalance simply to save our hides.

But beneath our hides, our souls are in great peril to the extent that we are not devoted to the cause of liberating the least among us. I believe that gospel ministry has centrally to do with feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, sheltering the homeless, treating the sick. I believe that Jesus meant it when he said that when we turn our back on one of these we have turned our back on Him, and that God will

not deal likely with those who do. I confess that when I cast about for ministries which embody this constancy of the gospel, I look first at Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker; at Koinonia Partners in Georgia; at Sojourners in Washington, D.C.; at the Reba Place Fellowship in Evanston; and hardly ever at the campus ministry.

Now, if I were asking you to abandon your posts and join the established Catholic Worker, my comments could be quickly dismissed. It would be presumptuous and wrong of me to assume that all campus ministers were being called elsewhere.

Of course there is an authentic calling to the campus ministry; I am simply arguing that our colleges and universities are intimately related to the plight and powerlessness of those who are sick and hungry and in prison. The claim of the gospel—for the next ten years and always—is to see that relationship for what it is, and to act in ways that work toward justice.

## III

What does this mean in the ministry to higher education? I must make it clear at the outset that it does *not* mean new and compelling courses about social problems and personal ethics. I think it makes very little difference *what* gets taught at the university so long as *why* it is being taught remains the same. That is, I believe that no amount of moral and religious content in the educational process will make a difference so long as the university's underlying dynamic and rationale is not educational but economic. The university's primary business, I argue, is not to educate but to distribute scarce goods and resources, to allocate wealth, status, and power. We will not comprehend the gospel's claim on the ministry to higher education until we see this fact—until we see clearly and concretely how the university enforces and re-inforces the historic disparities between rich and poor.

I know this is an old thesis for some of you, but since it has made no real impact on the shape of campus ministry, perhaps you will agree that it is worth discussing once more, at least in the form of a series of brief assertions:

1. Higher education's main product is a credential; that's what the university sells. Take away the credential and no one would pay the fees for the education that's left.

2. The purpose of the credential is to give certain persons access to upward mobility—to wealth, power, and status—and to see that others do not get same.

3. Presumably, the mobility one earns with a credential is based on competence. But since the university neither nurtures nor tests the kinds of competence required in a wide range of jobs, that presumption is generally false.

4. The main thing required to get a credential is money and cultural compatability with the style of the academic community. This means that those who are likely to be upwardly mobile anyway are most likely to get a credential whose purpose is upward mobility.

5. In line with the democratic ideal, this society has tried to give credentials to everyone. But doing so has made the B.A. less valuable. Now the sorting and sifting goes on at the graduate level—and even there the allocation mechanism is beginning to break down.

6. Because of the economic function of higher education, the moral content of education makes only marginal difference. No matter how many courses a student takes on the problems of the poor, the main reason for taking them is to get rich or at least secure. That's why the professors are teaching those courses, too.

No matter how you turn it, higher education is part of the problem, not part of the solution, when it comes to the relations of rich and poor. I do not believe that credentialling, and more of it, will solve the problems of poor people in this society or around the world. And I do believe that the dynamic of credentialling itself turns out graduates who, no matter what they have been taught, tend to be more interested in their own advancement than in economic sharing and justice. If campus ministry is to be responsive to the gospel claim of economic justice, one of its first tasks is to aid in dismantling the credentials industry.

I say "aid" because that dismantling is already underway. Higher education is undergoing a major dislocation in the American economy. The historic linkages between education, credentials, jobs, and other social rewards are being strained and broken as the society

discovers that the university may be a terribly inefficient and expensive way of training people for productive work. The symptoms of this malaise are all around us in higher education: enrollments level out or dip and doodle, endowments and annual contributions decline, graduates can't get jobs, and faculty can't keep theirs.

These facts should be signs of hope to anyone who wants to help right the relations of rich and poor through the educational process. They certainly point the way towards a mission for campus ministers. For one thing, they mean that higher education is losing its hold on the credentials market, losing its power to sort people into winners and losers. Since this is a power incompatible with true education, a power which has perverted our colleges and universities, *we* can celebrate a loss that the universities mourn. In fact, I think one of the most important kinds of campus ministry for the next ten years is to try to undermine the credentials business as thoroughly as possible. This will require hard research and sophisticated public interpretation—the aim of which would be to reduce the demand for credentials in the marketplace. We have tried to reach justice by increasing the supply of credentials, and it has backfired on us. Let us try now to reduce the demand for credentials. If we could, we would not only put employment on a firmer base, we would also free universities to educate human beings for human purposes by exorcising the demon degree.

There is another opportunity for ministry over the next ten years. It comes from the fact that many people in higher education—students, faculty, administrators—are in the painful process of giving up their illusions of security and learning the face of fear. I would not wish such pain on anyone, but when it comes there is opportunity for conversion. And university people need this conversion, toward the world-view of those who hunger and thirst and are homeless. The primary need in this pastorate is to help university people understand what is happening to them and why they feel as they do. I certainly sympathize with hurt and angry faculty members; I was once one of them! But it is cheap grace, false grace, to encourage such people to shore up their power with another book or a foundation grant or a faculty union. Whether they know it or not, faculty are angry because they are losing position in this society; they thought they had been promised a rose garden, and what they got is a bed of thorns. The

apocalyptic clash of oppressor and oppressed is underway, and academics are suffering the pain of discovering which side they are on. In that dislocation and disorientation there is hope that some people of knowledge and power will be sprung loose from their institutional prisons and become available for new movements toward justice. I think there is a vital campus ministry in trying to identify those people, bring them together, and encourage them toward new commitments and new life.

But all of this challenging of assumptions and all of this economic theory is only prelude. The question is whether campus ministers are available for this new life. For I believe, with many others, that the real task for the next ten years—at least for those who accept the constancy of the gospel—is to establish for ourselves a new way of living.

The gospel is incarnational, so the core challenge to the campus minister is to embody a way of life which is faithful both to the exigencies of the future and to the claims of the gospel. Here are a few specifics.

We must learn to live on less. As Jim Wallis has written, "The gospel knows nothing of what sociologists call 'upward mobility.' In fact, the gospel of Jesus Christ calls us to the reverse; the gospel calls us to a downward pilgrimage." And why such unworldly advice? Partly because learning to live on less is a prudent posture toward a future of shrinking resources. But more fundamentally, only by living on less can we *begin* to understand those who are the least among us, and thus being to minister to their need.

Learning to live on less is perhaps a symbol of a second, larger calling: We must learn to give up our attachments to all the accoutrements of security, status and power. In theological language, we must learn to live without idolatry. For many of us who are professionals that means, specifically, that we must learn to give up our attachment to "career," that model of adult life which causes us to lust after more rewards; to be more concerned about success and failure than about service; and which gives institutions a stranglehold on our consciences. I have a good friend who says that her vocation is to have no plan, and perhaps all authentic ministry is that way. Free of a life plan, we threaten vested interests and established powers which depend on people staying on track. Free of a life plan, we can

go where the need is, where God calls.

This new life also calls us to a radical form of sharing. I mean not only sharing goods and services, which is essential if we are to learn to live on less. I mean, more deeply than that, sharing feelings, sharing decisions, sharing power over our lives—in short, sharing all those things that we now stockpile in defense of our egos. The Christian life calls us beyond ego, beyond the false self, the defensive and assertive self, into the discovery of a true self which is one with others and one with the will of God. The next ten years will demand the development of a self which is *dependent* upon others not independent of them. Our current course leads inevitably to the war of all against all.

We are also called to a life of apparent risk-taking, for everything I have mentioned so far means leaving the securities to which we are accustomed and venturing on paths unknown. I say "apparent" risk-taking, because the real risk lies in continuing to live a life of individualism and acquisition and competition. *Those* are the paths toward destruction in our world, no matter how risky downward mobility and sharing may seem. We must learn to do the opposite of what the world's logic suggests; we must learn that by seeking our lives we lose them, and by losing our lives we find them. We must, to put it a bit differently, learn to rely less on our own plans and manipulations and more on God's grace, a grace which is often discovered in lonely prayer and which often appears misleading and even false.

## IV

Now, when I look at these elements of the life we are called to incarnate, two things occur to me. First, every element stands in distinct opposition to the life-style which the university breeds, and that is some measure of both the need for campus ministers to live this way—and the difficulty of doing it. The university fosters upward mobility and disparages the downward pilgrimage. The university weds us to social rewards, especially the rewards of career, rather than helping us declare independence of them. The university emphasizes autonomy and competition rather than sharing; indeed, when students share information with one another *it* is called cheating or plagiarism! The university trains us to plot and plan and minimize risk, to grow proud of their own ability to manipulate life, rather than helping us "let go" into God's grace. The whole style of

gospel life is antithetical to academic, and threatening to academics. It is a style which will find no support with the university community itself.

So the second thing which strikes me as I look at the gospel style of life is that no one person can live it alone. This is a life which requires a community of nurture and support. It requires the body of Christ, as the church was meant to be.

Only in community can we learn to live on less, not only because we can share goods and services, but because community replaces the deprivations of less with the abundance of life together. Only in community can we detach ourselves from individual rewards, for here we learn that the security those rewards bring is illusory compared to the reality of caring and being cared for by brothers and sisters. Only in community can we shatter the false ego and learn the ways of cooperation and interdependence. Only in community can we take the risks which make us vulnerable, for now there are others to share fear with us and stand by our side.

Ten years ago it was still possible to believe that the university might be a fulcrum of social change. Today, that is no longer the case. The university tends to respond to social change rather than initiate it. The university deals in empirical knowledge and logical analysis, but those are not the levels at which our problems lie. To the extent that our social ills have their roots in the maldistribution of work and its rewards, the university is much more part of the problem, not part of the solution.

The great need for the decades ahead is for the university—and all of our large institutions—to be surrounded by communities of commitment where different values are made manifest by lives differently lived. Such communities could foster change first by heightening the malaise of persons in the university about the values that now govern their lives. Such communities could foster change by offering options to those who would like to change the course of their lives but cannot see how to do it. And such communities could foster change by living lives of justice, both in their internal relations and in their relations to the world.

I lack time to detail a vision for such places, but several key elements should be mentioned. First, these communities would be places of prayer. In prayer will these groups find their sustenance, and

in prayer will they demonstrate to the university that there are ways of relating to reality more compelling than the analytic mode. Two, these communities will be places of human service. They will be open to those who hunger and thirst both physically and spiritually; they will risk the attempt to meet these basic human needs. Third, these communities will model new ways of teaching and learning, ways which grow directly from prayer and service. In these places, the university will see models of education aimed at need, not greed; education whose motives are interior rather than ulterior; education which fosters corporate effort rather than individual advancement. Fourth, these communities will be islands of personal commitment, in all its joy and struggle, allowing the university to say "see how they love one another." And because that love will be inclusive rather than exclusive, it will plant seeds of caring in rocky places.

## V

There is no blueprint for these communities, no manual of how to build one. They will come out of the hurt and the hope, the prayer and the actions, of those who find themselves drawn to the task. All we can say is that the task will be difficult but hopeful, which is more than one can say for the current course of affluent academic American life which may seem easy but is hopeless!

But we can identify with some precision those things that must change in the styles and structure of campus ministry if it is to participate in the building of Christian community. For one thing, the very idea of community means that the campus minister must become less the individual entrepreneur of the past and more a part of the body of Christ. The ministry of the laity must become more and more real, which means both that clergy must get out of the way and laity must be prepared to step forward. Very often where one of those factors has been present, the other has not.

Second, building Christian community on campus means that the ministry cannot be so totally dependent on transient students as many have become. Campus ministry must try harder to identify and cultivate an older, more settled generation of Christians. Some of these may be found on the faculty, administration, or other university staffs; some of them may come from the adult students one encounters at community colleges and in continuing education

programs. Moreover, community-building in campus ministry will mean that we involve people who are not directly related to higher education at all, but who simply come from the society that higher education needs to learn how to serve. In any event, the emphasis on community will raise serious questions about ministries which are centered exclusively on transient students.

Third, if campus ministry is to build Christian community it will mean major changes in the relations of those local ministries to the supporting institutions—denominational agencies, regional and national campus ministry associations. The latter are institutions, not communities, and it is well known that the two operate by different rules and move by different energies. I do not for a minute mean to disparage institutions as opposed to communities, for our institutions will not go out of business nor should they. What I do want to suggest is that the bureaucracies of the church must learn how to encourage rather than dampen the formation of Christian community.

Let me illustrate by commenting on the vexing problem of the "accountability" owed by a local campus ministry to a regional or national agency. If you are building community instead of just putting on programs, how do you account for what you are doing to the people who support you? Think of what is important in Christian community—the quality of its prayer life, the frankness and tenderness with which conflict is faced, its ability to stand up under the forces of fragmentation: How do you "account" for these things?

Perhaps these communities of campus ministry must become self-supporting, and much of what I have already said about the need for sharing and living on less tends in that direction. A good case can be made that community and outside funding are simply incompatible. But I am not willing to let the church off the hook that easily. For what is basically at stake in the question of funding is the ability of the church to understand that it is called to mission and self-giving and self sacrifice, and not simply to self-maintenance. Furthermore, it is called to a Biblical model of budgeting: from each according to his or her ability, to each according to his or her need. The wealthier parts of the body of Christ must support the poorer parts, or it is no longer the body of Christ.

There is no question that the fate of campus ministry, ten years

from now, will depend heavily on the reactions of denominations and local congregations. If the support base crumbles, the campus ministry may go with it, or it may find self-sufficient communal ways to carry on. The point is not to pray about campus ministry, but to pray about the church. If the institutional church cannot live/act out the gospel in the ten years ahead, God will simply have to find another way to get the work done. I am sure God will. I pray that we will be involved in that work.